How RCA "Tipped" The Radar Secret to the Axis, See Page Two

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 38 OCTOBER 24, 1953 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

McCarthy's Hoax and The Real Radar Scandal

The Signal Corps *whodunit* in which McCarthy is currently starring himself has an old history. Almost two years ago, on January 21, 1952, the late Eugene Cox of Georgia rose on the floor of the House of Representatives to call attention to reports that a spy ring was operating in the Signal Corps research center at Fort Monmouth, N. J. "Fortunately for the safety of the nation," Cox told the House solemnly, "no less than eight investigative agencies of the Army, the Government and the Congress are now inquiring into this affair."

Congressman Cox informed the House that these espionage charges were being investigated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities "with the full cooperation of its ranking Republican member, Congressman Velde", by the McCarran committee, by the FBI, the CIA, the Military District of Washington, the Army Counter-Intelligence Corps and Gen. J. Lawton Collins, then U. S. Army Chief of Staff, "who is receiving the coordinated reports of the military branches."

The result of these investigations was a two-paragraph press release at the Pentagon two months later. This statement said, "The Army has completed a thorough investigation of charges made late in January of this year (1952) by a group composed of 3 Army officers and 6 civilian employees of the Signal Corps Intelligence Agency of alleged subversive conditions in the Agency. This group petitioned Congress to investigate the alleged conditions."

"No evidence," the Army statement continued, "has been uncovered to establish the existence of any subversive elements in the Agency. The 'suspicious actions of certain of their colleagues' charged by the petitioning officers and civilian employes are the result, a spokesman said, of personality clashes and jealousies, in some cases coupled with honest suspicions."

It was to this that the Army referred after a week of the new McCarthy hearings when it issued a release last Friday saying, "The statement made in 1952 that there was no evidence that any documents had been compromised or that files had been tampered with in the Signal Corps Intelligence Agency is still correct. The documents alleged to have been missing at that time were accounted for."

Everybody Out of Step But McCarthy

The circus operated by McCarthy has sought to create the impression that the government is infiltrated by Reds and that no one can be trusted but the Senator from Wisconsin. In this case, he throws suspicion not only on the Army and Central Intelligence but also on the FBI, the Un-American Activities Committee and the McCarran committee. "Open hearings," the *Chicago Tribune* said in January, 1952, of the committee inquiries, "may be deferred for some time." None were ever held. Either these two older witch hunt committees were satisfied that there was no substance in the Fort Monmouth reports or they, too, are "dupes or worse."

The Fort Monmouth affair was a *Chicago Tribune* sensation. One need only go back and reread the original story as put into the *Congressional Record* by Cox to see how stale and discredited even then was McCarthy's latest. The story was based upon a petition to Congress by three Army officers and seven civilians employed at Fort Monmouth by the Signal Corps. They alleged a subversive plot in which 57 top secret documents were missing. (It is curious how often the number 57 turns up in the witch hunt. At one time McCarthy had 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. The number makes one wonder whether these visions originate at the breakfast table while staring in a trance at an H. J. Heinz —"57 varieties"—ketchup bottle.)

The charges had the moldy flavor of the stuff regurgitated in loyalty hearings. An example was "5. Numerous allegations of conversations in which certain employes talked in a vein indicating pro-Communism, in the opinion of complaining petitioners." Apparently these charges had already been investigated. Major General A. R. Bolling, assistant chief of staff, G-2 "revealed" at that time "that his men have been probing accusations against civilian employes of the Army Signal Intelligence Corps for more than a year," that one was found to be a Communist sympathizer and had resigned, that another had been dismissed but that "little tangible evidence of espionage or subversive activities" had been developed.

The FBI, Too, Had Investigated

The FBI, too, had been in on the inquiry. The *Chicago Tribune* gave its own sensation away to the discerning reader when it said near the end of the story, "After comprehensive investigations had been made by Army Intelligence and the FBI, indicating no activities of certain accused individuals outside the agency which would arouse suspicion, there was a tendency to attribute some complaints to office bickering between persons striving for authority. The petition to Congress and the report of missing documents, however, stirred the inquiry to great heights."

The ashes of old charges had been restirred by a group of office malcontents. The *Chicago Tribune* described how this little band "for weeks" had trooped the corridors of Congress. "In some instances," it said, "they were unable to get past the guardians of the outer offices of Senators and Representatives." In others "the sensational nature of their charges aroused in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How RCA "Tipped" The Radar Secret to The Axis

credulity." Finally Senators Hoey, McCarran and McCarthy and Representative Velde had interceded to get their charges a fresh hearing. The upshot was the dismissal of these charges by the Army in March, 1952, without protest by McCarran, Velde or McCarthy.

That there is still no evidence behind those closed doors was indicated by the curious phrasing of the statement issued last Saturday by Harold E. Rainville, administrative assistant to Senator Dirksen of Illinois, who sat in on the hearings for the Senator. Rainville said the number of civilian employes who had invoked the Fifth amendment "clearly indicates . . . widespread communism in one of the government's most secret enterprises." *But* "without a confession of actual theft of top secret radar information, we yet have no alternative to feeling that this Communist cell was not just a social affair." This backs into an anti-climax. Yet this is the most Rainville could say a day after one witness was alleged to have broken down and "confessed."

Racial Friction at Fort Monmouth

The real story dimly visible behind the scenes is this. There was a good deal of covert discrimination against Jews in engineering before the war. Many obtained jobs in the Signal Corps in the 30's and have seniority status now. The complainants seem all to have been non-Jews. There was friction, suspicion and jealousy. Julius Rosenberg worked at Fort Monmouth as a civilian specialist in 1942 and 1943. There is little social life at Fort Monmouth and the Jewish engineers there lived an ingrown social life. Associations natural at the time may now be made to appear sinister. This is what lies behind Rainville's odd phrasing, "we yet have no alternative to feeling that this Communist cell was not just a social affair."

Witnesses have been bullied and threatened, given virtual three degree treatment behind the closed doors. One woman witness was asked whether she did not deserve to get the same treatment as Ethel Rosenberg. One man was asked, "If you had wanted to steal secret documents, could you have done so?" When he replied, "But I didn't want to steal secret documents," McCarthy insisted, "But if you had wanted to. . ." One frightened witness seems to have denied knowing Rosenberg when they in fact shared the same car pool.

McCarthy has abused the purpose of executive sessions by giving out (from what little one can learn) fantastically one-sided versions of what occurred. The result has been to spread a nightmareish fantasy across the front pages of the nation's press with McCarthy as the hero.

What Did Happen A Decade Ago

Senator Potter's stand-in at the hearings, his administrative assistant, Robert L. Jones, said the evidence "should have been brought out ten years ago." A decade ago investigation would have brought out the fact that the secret of radar *had* been disclosed to a foreign enemy power, and that secret documents *had* disappeared. While McCarthy is chasing bogeymen, the real radar scandal was one of the least discussed scandals of war-time Washington.

The last time it was told the press generally ignored the story, and Hawkshaw McCarthy, already in the Senate and on the trail, paid no attention to it. The story may be found spread on the record of the hearings held by the Senate Labor and Education committee in July, 1950, on ethics in government. Drew Pearson was the witness. This is the story, as he told it under oath.

Radar was developed before the war by the Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth. Its development was surrounded with as much secrecy as the atom bomb. Certain employes of Radio Corporation of America, however, were trusted with access to the project. In 1936 a civilian employe of the Signal Corps, William D. Hershberger, who had played an important role in the development of radar, resigned from the Corps and went to work for RCA. Two years later RCA filed an application for the basic patent on radar.

That was in 1938, after Hitler had already seized Austria. The Army took steps to prevent the application from being made public and a patent from being granted lest the secret fall into the hands of a potential enemy. But it could not prevent RCA from filing patent applications abroad. RCA obtained patents in Australia and New Zealand, which published them. RCA also filed for patents in Germany and Japan, which denied the applications. But when war came both Germany and Japan used radar.

Doubling in Brass—For the RCA

After the war, the Army informed the patent office that it had put in six years of work on radar. The patent office was of the opinion that the Army was entitled to the patent. "Suddenly," Pearson said, "the Army cooled off." In 1946 the patent was granted RCA. Several individuals had shuttled back and forth between the Signal Corps and RCA: Hershberger; David Sarnoff, chairman of RCA, a brigadier general in the Signal Corps during the war; and Major Harry D. Newton, an RCA employe who also worked at Fort Monmouth. Pearson testified that after the war in 1946 Newton returned to Fort Monmouth "and made a request to see the files on secret radar developments."

Senator DOUGLAS. He was then a civilian?

Mr. PEARSON. Yes. Major Newton tried to get a civilian employed at Fort Monmouth, James Enright, to show him the file, but Enright called military intelligence, which put Newton on the carpet for a couple of hours. I do not think he was permitted to see the files, but those files mysteriously disappeared.

According to Pearson, there was talk of prosecuting RCA in connection with the radar patent. Major General Harry Ingles, who was then Chief of the Signal Corps, retired in March, 1947, to take an important position with RCA. "After General Ingles joined RCA," Pearson testified before the Senate committee, "his former outfit, the Signal Corps, cooled off regarding any prosecution of the Radio Corporation. The Army did send the entire radar patent matter to the Justice Department, however, where it has lain dormant for approximately four years."

No McCarthy hounds RCA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• ***Editor and Publisher,*** **I. F. STONE**

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

October 24, 1953 Vol. 1, No. 38

Around The Capitol

Peace

Farther off. Dulles at State Department Tuesday on his return from London had the cat-and-canary look. Churchill is the canary. As Dulles told the New York *Herald-Tribune* Forum that night "there were initial differences" at London but "these quickly fell into the background as we immersed ourselves in constructive efforts." This extends occupational therapy into the domain of diplomacy. There must have been a sour chuckle for Churchill in Dulles's remark in the same speech that our power is now "so large that there is danger that we seem to use it for coercion." Sir Winston, according to Dulles, was not coerced. He was merely given constructive work to do, lest idle thoughts turn again to Malenkov and Moscow.

Moscow

One of the main objectives of Dulles's policy—and Germany's (the two are growing inextinguishable)—is to push Russia back into gloomy Stalinist isolation. The anti-Churchill blast from Moscow, the first in many months, represents a victory for the State Department. The Russians in desperation are wooing France, but France has long lost the habit of initiative in European affairs (as will Britain, if the present trend continues). The State Department is feeding out a line intended even to disparage the fake olive branch of a non-aggression treaty, lest this somehow relax tension and interfere with German rearmament. Dulles is prepared to subordinate all else to the creation of an effective German-American military alliance.

Korea

It will be no loss if Korean peace talks are never held since there is not the faintest chance of an agreement which would satisfy Rhee and his Congressional supporters. To hold a conference under these conditions would merely be to dramatize failure, to exacerbate East-West relations and to make the inevitable Rhee walkout (with ourselves in his wake) a means of heightening world tension and creating a new crisis atmosphere. The meaning of the Dulles line that we will only discuss broader Asian issues if the Korean conference succeeds is both simple and subtle. This means that the Chinese, who might be ready to bargain Korea against Formosa and a broader settlement, will be asked to relinquish North Korea to Rhee with no assurance on these other issues. In leaving no room for negotiation, we ensure failure in advance.

Israel

The new crisis marked by the suspension of economic aid to Israel is to be read in the light of the familiar Middle Eastern patterns, which have not been changed by Israel's achievement of independence. If concessions have to be made to the Arabs, the Jewish community in the Middle East is the easy expendible. The State Department takes the side of France against the Arabs in Morocco and of Britain against the Arabs on Suez. It must take the Arab side somewhere.

In the old days before independence, the Mandatory power always managed to overlook Arab excesses and bear down hard on Jewish resistance. So it is today. Since the Tripartite Declaration of May, 1950, there have been 866 armed Arab attacks across the border and 421 Israeli killed and injured. All this was regarded with characteristic equanimity but the reprisal raid against Kibya is greeted with horror and Israel is brought before the bar of the UN.

The Jordan water issue is inflated beyond all reason. The Israeli are digging a channel to be used ultimately for the development of hydroelectric power in the Huleh valley. No water has yet been diverted. When it is, the water will flow back again into the Jordan. The river flows through Israeli territory in that area and Israel is prepared to safeguard Arab interests in the operation.

The State Department crowd is irked because it had been working secretly on another TVA plan for the Jordan, Litani and Yarmuk river systems. It wants an international setup under its own aegis in the hope of playing politics with water as a means of appeasing the Arabs. This, too, repeats a pattern familiar under the Mandate. The Arab States are hostile to any water scheme, because it would involve recognition of Israel and cooperation with it. In the meantime, the Israeli have been going ahead on their own—just as the *Yishuv* used to do under the British, who were exasperated in just the same way.

RIP — IWO

The International Workers Order suffered its death blow this week when the Supreme Court refused to hear its appeal from an order of dissolution by the New York State Superintendent of Insurance. A benefit society with 162,000 members and $6,500,000 in assets, with a margin of safety over statutory requirements of 40.37 percent, was ordered dissolved purely as "a political hazard." The words quoted are those of the Superintendent of Insurance. The case establishes a new high water mark in guilt by association. What if a reform government some day were to revoke the charter of a bank because it did not like the political opinions of the bank's officers?

"EMOTIONAL APPEAL HELD KEY TO SALES"

Said the headline on the financial page last Wednesday. So what I can I do for an emotional appeal? Print a picture of my children barefoot in the snow outside the U.S. Treasury? Those renewals have started coming in—with some of the kindest and most heartening letters any newspaperman ever received—but there are only 12 shopping weeks left before Vol. 1 ends. Those of you who can will save the editor and publisher a lot of headaches and expense by getting your renewal in now. And don't forget you can get a 2-year sub for $9 or send the *Weekly* as a gift to a friend for another $4. Use the blank on the reverse side TODAY and many thanks. —I. F. STONE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Both Sides Ought to Persuade POWS to go Home

Life Magazine this week has given us the pictures of twenty American prisoners of war in Korea who have told their captors they do not want to be repatriated. There is nothing unusual in the appearance of these men; a "composite" picture of the twenty would very closely resemble the typical young American male of the shirt ads, the hair slickum ads, the Armed Services recruiting posters with which three wars —and the times between—have made us all familiar. Looking at these faces it is difficult for any American not to echo the puzzled inquiry of the father of one of the prisoners, addressed to him viva voce by a recording arranged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "Son, what on earth is the matter with you?"

The VFW recordings have been made and sent to Korea in the hope of conveying to the prisoners, Life tells us, "the enormity of renouncing their own country." Conceivably these messages from the families of the prisoners if permitted to go through will be more effective than the arguments our explanation teams make at Panmunjom. In any case the "reconversion" of any one of these prisoners will be regarded by his countrymen as a happy event, a natural and wholesome thing, and the best possible solution of the strange "reluctant prisoner" problem that has risen from the strange war in Korea.

What is amazing is our evident unwillingness to apply exactly the same reasoning to the situation of the far greater number of prisoners in our own hands who have declared that they do not want to go home. Whether or not as the other side charges we have "invented" obstacles to their effort to convince these prisoners to change their minds and accept repatriation, we certainly have gone to great lengths to protect these prisoners from high pressure arguments from their own countrymen and have been quick to applaud their demonstrations against exposure even to the explanations promised in the truce agreement.

Yet plainly if the renunciation of one's country is an "enormity," it is enormous for others than Americans. The North Koreans who do not want to go back to North Korea, the Chinese who vociferously demand to be sent to Formosa instead of back to their homes have an attitude which should be as inexplicable and as unfortunate to us, and to their own people, as the attitude of our lad who chooses not to be sent back to Arkansas. And simply by conceding the non-exclusiveness of our own feeling toward our own. We ought to be able to realize that the best possible solution for the whole exchange problem would be for all prisoners, theirs and ours, to decide to go back to the villages, the farms and the families from which they were dragged to war.

The truth is, I am afraid, that we still are trying to eke some sort of token of "victory" out of the tragic struggle in Korea, and that our concern is far more for turning the turncoating of these recalcitrants in our bag of PWs to propaganda effect than for the fate of the prisoners themselves. Our purpose in this confounds our ordinary concepts of "right" and "wrong." Some of these prisoners deserted to us on the field of battle, surely a crime in a soldier: we rationalize it as a "flight to freedom." We professed a mission of liberation: thus the renunciation of country by men of the other side, which in our own we proclaim an "enormity," must be seen as a virtuous choice.

The acid test of our fellow feeling for these freedom-choosing prisoners would be a proposal that they all be settled not in Syngman Rhee's parlous domain nor in far-away Formosa but on the really-free soil of Australia—or California.

On the completion of the prisoner exchange depends in large degree the success of the peace negotiations. This is the great goal. Whatever would expedite the exchange would favor the peace. Instead of bickering over the competing explanations to the prisoners, and seeking to make propaganda of the PWs' decision to stay or to return, both sides should join in helping the prisoners to choose to go home. What is wrong is not so much what is the matter with the reluctant young men of either side as what is the matter with the rest of us who assure that loyalty to home must and should mean less to the son of one land than to the son of another.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

10-24-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED